

REMARKS

The Restriction Requirement mailed November 17, 2004 required the applicant to elect between two patentably distinct species of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Restriction Requirement required election of either Group 1, having inside corner scoring as illustrated in Figures 4 and 5, or Group 2, having outside corner scoring as illustrated in Figure 12. In the Communication mailed February 22, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the paper filed by applicant on November 30, 2004 in response to the Restriction Requirement was not fully responsive because applicant failed to elect a single species of claims for prosecution on the merits.

To correct the noted deficiency of applicant's response to the Restriction Requirement, the applicant hereby elects the species of Group 1, claims 2-12, 15-21 and 99-105. Dependent claims 13 and 22 have been withdrawn from prosecution at this time.

Although claims 13 and 22 have been withdrawn from prosecution at this time, the applicant expressly requests reconsideration of these claims if one or both of the corresponding base claims 3 and 15 are finally held to be allowable.

The fee for a three-month extension of time is enclosed. The Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any deficiency in fees herein to Deposit Account No. 50-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Stephen E. Arnett
Registration No. 47,392

Date: MARCH 11, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000